APPEARANCES (ALL PARTICIPANTS APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY): 1 2 3 On behalf of Plaintiffs: 4 PETER H. WEINBERGER, ESQ. 5 Spangenberg, Shibley & Liber 1001 Lakeside Avenue, Suite 1700 1900 East Ninth Street 6 Cleveland, Ohio 44114 7 216-696-3232 pweinberger@spanglaw.com 8 9 SALVATORE C. BADALA, ESQ. HUNTER J. SHKOLNIK, ESQ. 10 400 Broadhollow Road, Suite 305 Melville, New York 11747 11 212-397-1000 sbadala@napolilaw.com 12 hunter@napolilaw.com 13 DONALD MIGLIORI, ESQ. 14 LINDA SINGER, ESQ. JOSEPH F. RICE, ESQ. 15 Motley Rice LLC 28 Bridgeside Boulevard 16 Mount Pleasant, South Carolina 29465 843-216-9140 17 dmigliori@motleyrice.com lsinger@motleyrice.com 18 jrice@motlevrice.com 19 PAUL J. HANLY, JR., ESQ. 20 Simmons Hanly Conroy LLC 112 Madison Avenue 21 New York, New York 10016 212-784-6400 22 phanly@simmonsfirm.com 23 24 25

APPEARANCES (ALL PARTICIPANTS APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY): On behalf of Plaintiffs: STEVEN SKIKOS, ESQ. Skikos, Crawford, Skikos & Joseph, LLP One Sansome Street, Suite 2830 San Francisco, California 94104, (415) 546-7300 sskikos@skikos.com TROY RAFFERTY, ESQ. Levin, Papantonio, Thomas, Mitchell, Rafferty & Proctor, P.A. 316 South Baylen Street, Suite 600 Pensacola, Florida 32502 850-435-7500 trafferty@levinlaw.com

kobrin@marcus-shapira.com
livingston@marcus-shapira.com

2.3

2.4

25

APPEARANCES (ALL PARTICIPANTS APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY): On behalf of Defendant Walmart, Inc.: TINA M. TABACCHI, ESQ. TARA A. FUMERTON, ESQ. JOHN M. MAJORAS, ESQ. Jones Day 77 West Wacker Suite 3500 Chicago, Illinois 60601 312-782-3939 ttabacchi@jonesday.com tfumerton@jonesday.com jmajoras@jonesday.com

14:57:25 25

Scott Livingston.

1	THE CLERK: I heard Robert Barnes and
2	Scott Livingston.
3	How about for Discount Drug Mart?
4	(No response.)
5	THE CLERK: How about Rite Aid?
6	MS. MOORE: Kelly Moore for Rite Aid.
7	MR. LAVELLE: John Lavelle for Rite Aid.
8	MR. FOUTS: Greg Fouts for Rite Aid.
9	THE CLERK: Very good.
10	Who do I have for Walmart?
11	MS. TABACCHI: Tina Tabacchi. Tara Fumerton
12	and John Majoras are also on.
13	THE CLERK: Did I hear John Majoras and Tara
14	Fumerton?
15	MR. MAJORAS: Yes.
16	MS. FUMERTON: Hi. Yes.
17	Sorry, John.
18	MR. MIGLIORI: Don Migliori is on for Summit
19	County.
20	MR. SHKOLNIK: And Hunter Shkolnik for
21	Cuyahoga. Good afternoon.
22	THE CLERK: Hi.
23	Okay. So for Cuyahoga I have Hunter and Salvatore
24	Badala.
25	Do I have Frank Gallucci?

1	MS. SINGER: And Linda Singer is on for Summit
2	as well. Good afternoon.
3	THE CLERK: Okay. For Summit I hear
4	Linda Singer and Don Migliori.
5	Do I have Pete Weinberger on here?
6	MR. WEINBERGER: Yes, Helen. I'm on. Thank
7	you.
8	THE CLERK: Very good.
9	How about Steve Skikos?
10	Oh, there's a bunch of you.
11	SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: Hi, Helen. It's David.
12	THE CLERK: All right. Perfect.
13	David, is Judge Ruiz going to be on this line?
14	SPECIAL MASTER COHEN: I don't
15	MAGISTRATE JUDGE RUIZ: Yes, Helen, I'm on.
16	THE CLERK: Okay. Very good. Okay.
17	MR. RAFFERTY: Troy Rafferty is on.
18	MR. KOBRIN: Josh Kobrin for Giant Eagle.
19	MR. RICE: Joe Rice is on.
20	THE CLERK: Is Tim Johnson on yet for Drug
21	Mart?
22	MR. JOHNSON: I am.
23	THE CLERK: Very good.
24	I'm just going to look for a couple of people and then
25	I think we're ready to go, because I know we have

representatives for all the defendants.
Is Troy Rafferty on?
MR. RAFFERTY: Yes, I'm on.
THE CLERK? How about Mark Lanier?
MR. WEINBERGER: Mark is tied up in another
hearing. He may try to join if the hearing if the other
hearing ends.
THE CLERK: Okay. Paul Hanley or Paul
Farrell?
MR. HANLEY: Hanley is on.
THE CLERK: Okay. That's good.
That's pretty much all the plaintiffs on this list.
So I'm going to talk to Judge Polster. I don't think
I'm going to be doing a roll call. I'm just going to let
him know who is here, and we'll be with you shortly.
Thank you.
THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. I
hope everyone is staying safe.
All right. I received the status report, so, as I
understand it, while the plaintiff waived jury, the
defendant will not.
Oh, I just want to make sure we have a court reporter;
is that correct?
THE REPORTER: Yes, Your Honor. I'm on.
I'm having a little hard time hearing you compared to

the last hearing.

1

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

15:04:08 25

15:02:28 5

15:02:57 10

15:03:16 15

15:03:48 20

THE COURT: Well, I'm now in my office. All right?

This is obviously a status call in the Opioid MDL 1:17-md-2804 with the lawyers for the plaintiffs and the pharmacies who -- so we're discussing the trial that's now scheduled in November and the following.

And I think there's someone on the phone who is not muted, so everyone please mute unless you're speaking.

While the plaintiffs will waive jury; the defendants will not. So the November trial will be in front of the jury.

The parties believe that in the event the plaintiffs prevail, the abatement phase, which will be to the Court, will take approximately two weeks, and the parties are working on determining how to supplement it.

Our Court began jury trials this week. So Judge Gwin had a short trial. He was able to do it successfully. A couple of other judges will be having trials later this month and in October.

Our Court is meeting on Monday, October the 5th, to determine what we're going to do in November and December. We will make a collective decision, and then I anticipate that all judges will abide by it. I certainly will, and that will dictate whether or not we'll be able to keep with

the schedule for November 9th. But at this point that trial is on.

The last time I checked, roughly -- we had sent -- the jury department had sent inquires to about a thousand people, prospective jurors, to ask whether they were willing and able to serve for a four- to five-week trial in November.

The last time I checked, roughly 600 of the 1,000 had responded, and about 150 had said they were able to do so.

So if we go forward, I'm confident we'll have -- we'll have jurors -- to pick jurors in the venire, and we'll be able to find 12 jurors who can be fair and impartial.

Toward that end, I will be sending to the clerk's office later this week the case specific jury questionnaire the Court fashioned with the parties. We've added in all the witnesses.

I was dismayed to see that that witness list is over 200 people. Obviously, everyone knows we can't have even have a small fraction of 200 people in a four-week trial, but -- I mean, so be it. They'll go through those names.

If the trial is going forward, that questionnaire will be sent out the afternoon of October 5th and October 6th.

We can stay on schedule.

And then we have another status conference the afternoon of October 5th, so I can report to everyone

15:04:52 10

15:04:30 5

11 12

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

13

14

15:05:22 15

16

17

18

19

15:05:39 20

21

22

23

24

15:06:08 25

1 whether the trial is going forward. 2 The status report reflects, of course, that mediation 3 with Judge Gandhi is ongoing. 4 Is anything of significance happening? Are you making any progress is all I want to know. 15:06:32 5 MS. TABACCHI: Your Honor, this is 6 7 Tina Tabacchi from Jones Day. 8 Judge Gandhi has asked all the parties to the 9 mediation to sign a confidentiality agreement, which really precludes any characterization of the mediation on the 15:06:47 10 11 record. 12 THE COURT: Well, I don't want to know any details. I want to know, are you having -- are you having 13 serious discussions? All right. Because there need to be 14 15:07:05 15 serious discussions, and if Judge Gandhi is not able to 16 facilitate them, you need to do something else. 17 I just -- everyone knows what serious discussion is. 18 I mean, if -- at the last -- at the last status conference, 19 the plaintiffs basically said that nothing was happening and 15:07:24 20 they were prepared to just end them. 21 I gather they haven't ended or else that would be in 22 the report.

MS. TABACCHI: Your Honor, I can report that

the pharmacy defendants have had numerous discussions with

Judge Gandhi and with representatives of the plaintiffs

23

24

15:07:39 25

1	since our last status hearing.
2	THE COURT: All right.
3	MS. TABACCHI: The discussions are ongoing.
4	THE COURT: All right. Well, that's fine.
15:07:48 5	That's all I need to know, that they are ongoing and active.
6	All right? That's fine.
7	All right. And that's all I needed to know, but it
8	was my obligation to at least learn that.
9	And then there are some matters that I'm still working
15:08:09 10	on. I issued an order earlier this week on the motion for
11	reconsideration, so that's taken care of.
12	There are a couple of other pending motions that we're
13	dealing with. I'm expecting replies on the motions in
14	limine.
15:08:30 15	There's an objection to Special Master Cohen's
16	Discovery Ruling 23 that I'm
17	So is there anything else that I've overlooked or that
18	anyone wants to bring up?
19	MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, this is this
15:09:00 20	is Pete Weinberger for the plaintiffs.
21	On page 6 of the status report, we've raised a couple
22	of issues, not that they have to be dealt with today, but I
23	wanted to the plaintiffs wanted to make sure that the
24	Court knew that those were issues that were on the agenda,
15:09:24 25	and I'm assuming that we can deal with many of these issues

with Special Master Cohen. And to the extent that we need assistance of the Court, we will seek that assistance.

The fact that the Court raised the issue of the number of witnesses that are on the appendix to the jury questionnaire leads me to this issue:

The plaintiffs have identified approximately 50 witnesses, and that as we've indicated to Special Master Cohen, we intend to prune that down, you know, as we -- as we approach trial.

With respect to the defendants' witnesses, which number about 200 among the six defendants, there are -- there are a number of witnesses that were not previously disclosed in any discovery, which we will deal with through Special Master Cohen.

But one of the categories of witnesses that the defendants have disclosed are approximately 12 physicians in the Northern District of Ohio whose names have not previously appeared in any discovery. They are -- there's some orthopedic surgeons. There are some pain management doctors. There are -- there's an anesthesiologist and a pain management. There's a family doctor. Among those -- there's a hematologist, oncologist -- among the -- among the physicians who they've named. And we intend to file a motion to strike those witnesses to prevent them from testifying on the basis that they were never previously

15:11:44 25

15:09:53 5

1 disclosed.

So I wanted the Court to be --

THE COURT: I mean, obviously, the defendants are going to have to have a very good justification for coming up with new witnesses on the eve of trial. Maybe they have it, maybe they don't.

So the defendants need to understand they're going to have to have a very compelling reason why 12 doctors have just materialized now on the eve of trial.

And obviously, the plaintiff -- the defendants are going to have to make those doctors available for deposition if I allow you -- if I allow you to call them, put them on the witness list. And if they're not willing to be deposed, they're off. That's the rule. So I'll wait and see what happens with that.

Also not going to spend a lot of my time or Special Master Cohen's time dealing with complaints about authenticity. All right? You all work that out.

ARCOS data, documents produced (indiscernible), again, you know, if there's a real question about authenticity, fine. But most of those documents would be.

So I have very limited time and I'm not -- I'm going to cut through a lot of objections quickly if the parties don't themselves.

But, again, I don't know why -- 200 witnesses, in my

15:12:12 10

15:11:54 5

11

12

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

13

14

15:12:30 15

16

17

18

19

15:12:52 20

21

22

23

24

15:13:10 25

15:14:39 25

15:13:34 5

15:13:44 10

15:14:06 15

15:14:22 20

opinion, is ridiculous. You each only have a relatively small number of hours. There couldn't be anywhere close to 200 witnesses, defense witnesses, that will get anywhere near the witness stand, but ...

MR. STOFFELMAYR: Judge, it's Kaspar Stoffelmayr.

I don't know if you were looking for a response to any of those comments. You know, we certainly understand and hear your views.

I don't think there's a ripe issue. I think there will be a very small number of authenticity issues, if any, that are in front of the Court, true authenticity issues. There may be other admissibility questions that are more difficult, but I don't think authenticity is one of them except in the very unusual case.

And I think everyone knows that the witness lists are going to have to get a lot shorter. You know, plaintiffs have 52 people on their witness list. We know that the real number is something like 10 or 15. Their number will drop as will ours. But that's something that's going to happen between now and -- you know, now and the start of trial, I'm sure.

THE COURT: All right. Well, this means the prospective jurors have to go through 200 names, and quite frankly, they may get glazed over, so -- but they've got all

1 those names. 2 All right. Well, then I guess we'll be confirmed again on October the 5th in the afternoon, and I'll address 3 4 the things that are on my plate, the pending motions, by then. Whether I'll resolve the motions in limine by then, I 15:15:06 5 don't know. Maybe some of them. Some I can deal with, some 6 7 may have to wait until trial. It depends on 8 what (indiscernible) understands that. 9 THE REPORTER: It depends on what, Your Honor? THE COURT: On what happens at trial. 15:15:27 10 11 So there may be some I can't resolve as a practical 12 issue. 13 All right. Stay safe, everyone. 14 Those who celebrated New Year, Happy New Year, and 15:15:44 15 we'll convene again on October the 5th. 16 Thank you. 17 MR. WEINBERGER: Your Honor, this is Peter --18 THE COURT: People are signing off. 19 Go ahead, Pete. 15:15:54 20 MR. WEINBERGER: You have before you --21 they're not motions, but both sides submitted preliminary 22 statements to the jury for your review. We couldn't arrive 23 at an agreed preliminary statement, so I'm assuming that's

THE COURT: Peter, I haven't even looked at

2.4

15:16:14 25

on your agenda.

15:17:51 25

15:16:31 5

15:16:51 10

15:17:08 15

15:17:21 20

it. How you couldn't even agree on a preliminary statement, that's pretty pathetic. Maybe I'll get it -- maybe I'll figure it out at trial. I'm -- you know, I'm not worried about that. I'm pretty dismayed that the parties couldn't even agree on that. Couldn't agree on jury instructions, I'm doing that myself.

So it will get done when it gets done. When you'll see it, maybe the morning of trial. But, obviously, I'm going to instruct the jury something. I don't really care if the parties don't agree. You know what? I'll give them the -- I'll give them the statement that I'll give them.

So if they don't agree on it, I'll tell them what I want to tell them. If you don't like it, you can object. Either way.

But I haven't given it a minute thought, candidly, Pete.

All right. Anything else anyone wants to bring up?

MR. WEINBERGER: Well, Your Honor, this is
Pete again.

I fully expected your reaction to that, and I can just tell you that, you know, we worked hard to reach an agreement. But the reason that I raised the preliminary statement is that this agreement revolves around the fundamental question of to what extent these pharmacy defendants are able to talk about and point fingers at the

1 claims that -- at the other defendants who 2 are -- whose -- who are not going to be in this trial, some 3 of whom settled, and its relevance to a particular case, and 4 certainly, what the focus of this case will be. And that's where the fundamental disagreement is. 15:18:18 5 know, it's our -- you know, our statement and it's our 6 7 belief that this case revolves primarily around the conduct 8 of these defendants and whether or not they created a public 9 nuisance or substantially contributed to it. Whereas, the defendants believe that --15:18:36 10 11 THE CLERK: Hang on, everybody. Judge Polster 12 got disconnected. I'm just reconnecting him. Give me just 13 a moment, please. 14 MR. WEINBERGER: Okay. 15:19:05 15 THE COURT: All right. I got disconnected. 16 But Pete was saying something and I got disconnected. 17 MR. WEINBERGER: Right. 18 So I'll sort of start from the beginning. 19 The reason that I raised the question about the 15:19:18 20 preliminary statements is that it -- they certainly make 21 clear that we have two divergent views on what this trial is 22 going to be about. 23 The plaintiffs believe the case is about the conduct 2.4 of the pharmacy defendants and whether or not they

substantially contributed to create the public nuisance.

15:19:39 25

Whereas, the defendants clearly want to focus on the conduct of non- -- of nondefendants, some of whom settled, some of whom didn't so, and believe that the focus of the case should, to a large extent, be on the conduct of either defendants who previously settled, defendants who didn't settle, or non- -- nondefendants.

And so that's why I raise the issue of your view of the preliminary -- at least the preliminary statement to the jury. So that's why I raised it, Your Honor.

MR. STOFFELMAYR: And, Judge, it's Kaspar Stoffelmayr.

I don't think this is the time or the place to sort of argue a motion in limine that -- I'm not sure if it's been filed. I don't think so. You know, the Court will obviously look at the preliminary statements and do what it thinks is right.

But I guess it's sort of stating the obvious that plaintiffs are free to focus on whatever they want to. But it's not up to plaintiff to tell defendants what they must focus on.

And, obviously, one of the important questions at this trial is going to be what did cause the opioid crisis, and I don't think there's any view in the world where that's not a relevant question.

THE COURT: All right. I was going to say

15:20:25 10

15:20:03 5

12

13

11

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

14

15:20:40 15

16

17

18 19

15:20:55 20

21

22

2.4

15:21:11 25

1 pretty much that. Each side has a certain number of hours. 2 The plaintiffs' burden is to show that one or more 3 defendants caused the public nuisance. Defendants can 4 defend however they want. If the defendants want to spend their limited hours 15:21:31 5 showing that if there was a public nuisance caused by 6 7 others, they can do that. If they simply want to say, Hey, 8 we didn't do anything wrong and they can -- they've got the 9 out. 15:21:50 10 I'm not going to be -- my neutral statement is not going to talk about others. All right? I'll just say what 11 12 the plaintiffs have to prove. All right? 13 Okay. You know, they've got to prove that one or more defendants caused a public nuisance. And I'll probably tell 14 15:22:10 15 the jury something about what a public nuisance is. I'm not 16 going to try anyone's case in the preliminary statement to 17 jurors. 18 But, again, the defendants can defend however they want within the rules, of course. 19 15:22:28 20 All right. Was there anything else? 21 MR. WEINBERGER: Not from the plaintiffs' 22 perspective. Thank you, Judge. 23 2.4 THE COURT: Okay. From the defendants? 15:22:39 25 MR. STOFFELMAYR: No.